

VALUES AND PHILOSOPHIZING ABOUT MUSIC EDUCATION

ESTELLE R. JORGENSEN

Indiana University

jorgense@indiana.edu

In this essay, a quintet of values in doing philosophy of music education are examined: the need for a broad view, a personal perspective, a constructive vision, a relevant plan, and the courage to speak about important issues in music education. The following questions frame the analysis of each, in turn: What do these values mean? What importance do they hold today? How can they be expressed practically in the life and work of philosophers and those interested in the philosophy of music education?

I speak of a quintet of values that goes to the heart of doing philosophy of music education, namely, the need for a broad view, a personal perspective, a constructive vision, a relevant plan, and the courage to speak about issues of importance to music education.

I aspire to these values as ideals, and I suppose that philosophers of music education already share them in one fashion or another. As there is nothing particularly new here, why speak of them again? My sense is that given the particular academic pressures and expectations today, and in the way of philosophy, it is useful to revisit them for our time, and to ask: What do these values mean? What

© *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 22, no. 1 (Spring 2014)

importance do they hold today? How can they be expressed practically in our lives as philosophers and those interested in the philosophy of music education? In response to this nest of questions, I consider each value in turn.

A BROAD VIEW

Philosophy is rooted in the ancient societies of Eurasia and woven into the oral traditions and mythologies of ancient people from Africa, Australia and Oceania, and the Americas. Wherever human beings have established civilizations, they have sought answers to existential questions: Where did I come from? What is my purpose in life? Where am I going? Matters of life and death, ethics, aesthetics, civics, among a host of individual and socio-cultural concerns, persist worldwide and throughout recorded history. Archeological evidence of ancient people caring for those who are disabled and the arts practiced in Stone Age civilizations exemplify persistent and widespread ethical and aesthetic values.¹ The ways of philosophizing may differ from time to time and place to place, illustrated by the aphorisms, figurative discourse, and stories of ancient Chinese philosophy, and the deductive approaches grounded in symbolic logic of modern Western philosophy, but they constitute, at root, a search for meaning and truth.

Seeking answers to philosophical questions in music education requires grasping the sweep of philosophical discourse. This task is challenging especially because philosophy is clothed in the languages of particular times and places. To read the ancient Greek philosophers, one should ideally master classical Greek; to know ancient Chinese philosophers, one would be best served by a working knowledge of classical Chinese; to understand European medieval philosophy, one should be able to read Latin. Knowledge of languages also enables a richer grasp of the cultures of which these languages are a part. While translations of texts offer windows through which one may glimpse something of the original ideas, they are transformations of sorts. Notwithstanding the importance of knowing languages for philosophy, in North American music education, at least, the study of foreign languages is not widely required for doctoral study, and principal philosophical texts and musical treatises in languages other than English lie out of the reach of too many American music educators. Changes in languages over time also render ancient texts less accessible to contemporary readers. Given the literate emphasis in much philosophy, oral philosophical traditions, such as those of the aboriginal peoples of Australia and North America, are largely hidden from view. In the face of these challenges, although seeking a global view of philosophy in music education puts a premium on the study of languages and their respective cultures, practically speaking, it also requires the translation of philosophical ideas from one linguistic group to another.

Philosophers have long done their work among friends whose ways of think-

ing resonate with their own. Some speak of their affinity for particular ideas in almost religious terms. For example, Richard Shusterman describes his conversion from analytic philosophy to American pragmatism as a key to addressing perplexing questions.² Lately, a group of philosophers has developed a cross-disciplinary field of experimental philosophy as a way to bridge the divide between philosophy and science and rectify an impasse that is viewed as detrimental to both means of inquiry.³ These ideas fly in the face of mid-twentieth century, post-modernist criticisms of the rationality underpinning science and philosophy. While philosophers of education may give credence to the philosophical canon, educational theorists in other educational specialties such as curriculum have been influenced particularly by intellectual movements such as feminism, post-modernism, and critical theory. What is called “philosophical” in education often amounts to philosophy in the weak sense of the word. The writing may be reflective, but too often it is not informed by a broad and deep grasp of the literature that has counted historically as philosophy. It may also be tempting to use particular technical terms in ways that are exclusionary and understood only by the relative few who share a particular philosophical mindset. Small groups cluster around particular theorists or philosophers and their schools, and the lack of a broad basis of philosophical reading makes it more difficult to be sufficiently informed about philosophy writ large and to choose one’s philosophical friends wisely and well.

Taking a broad view begins with building on the particular philosophical heritages that are our own. Beyond the various starting points reflective of the places and times at which we work, and the different philosophical traditions in our various languages, philosophers of music education also draw on works that are excluded from or marginalized in the traditional canon, or otherwise emanate from beyond philosophy’s borders. As there is no particular philosophical virtue in espousing the latest ideas, inspiration can be found in philosophical ideas past and present. Philosophers throughout the ages have had remarkable insights into the nature of humanity; they have been forever going back and rethinking old ideas, often clothing them in new dress, and transforming them for their own times. Knowing the philosophical canon enables one to better appreciate and critique the work of philosophy’s critics and marginal-dwellers (those who Jacques Deleuze and Felix Guattari would doubtless characterize as philosophical “nomads”).⁴ Since I teach in the West, my classes naturally focus on the Anglo-American tradition and European Continental philosophy. I recall a semester spent excavating Kant’s *Critique of Aesthetic Judgment*—part 1 of his *Critique of Judgment*, the crux of his trilogy on reason. There was much to admire and criticize in our study of a classic translation by James Creed Meredith.⁵ Students were caught up not only in the architecture of Kant’s thought but in his answers

to the puzzle of how one makes judgments based on feeling, why the arts have meaning, and why the arts are important in everyday life. We took away from this study a deeper grasp of the power of ideas across time and space, a respect for Kant's ideas, and a heightened awareness of their limits and flaws, and we were better equipped to evaluate the criticisms of his aesthetic and educational writing by his detractors.

Being a philosopher in a community also broadens our perspectives. Forest Hansen points to the conversational character of philosophy, and the importance of openness to the differing views of others.⁶ Rather than using words destructively as weapons, Hansen makes the case for thinking of our philosophizing dialogically, civilly, compassionately, and humanely. In the International Society for Philosophy of Music Education, we have the opportunity to converse across our linguistic borders through the medium of a *lingua franca*. Although this reality privileges one language over others, we benefit from the insights of those in our midst who work in languages that are not widely spoken or are known by some but not by others. Valuable translations occur as we converse about the ideas that may be at home in some languages but not in others—witness our conversations about the meaning of European terms such as *didaktik*, *bildung*, and *paideia* and North American conceptions of *praxialism* and *aesthetic education*. I would like to see this conversation broaden to include Asian, African, and South American views as well as those oral traditions that are largely hidden from view. In particular, the gulf between English and Spanish (and Portuguese) speakers in the Americas urgently needs to be bridged. Notwithstanding the daunting breadth of philosophical traditions around the world, as an international society, we need to embrace this plethora of traditions even as we struggle to broaden and deepen our individual perspectives.

To take a broad philosophical perspective in the midst of the “multiplicities and pluralities” of contemporary societies requires not only a generous spirit and inclusive attitude, but meticulous scholarship.⁷ This is particularly important in the face of a practice in some quarters of selectively and narrowly referencing the work of the writer's friends, and omitting, ignoring, or co-opting the important work of others. Doing philosophy with friends and in community requires giving credit to others who have plowed the conceptual ground before us, including those with whom one disagrees in the philosophical conversation, and ensuring that others' perspectives are heard and valued. Selectively citing the work of others or excluding particular philosophical approaches or authors from publication needlessly politicizes the work of philosophizing about music education and fails to represent the breadth and even-handedness that one would expect from philosophical scholarship in music education.

Broader, more comprehensive, inclusive, and even-handed approaches to the

publication of scholarship in the philosophy of music education are needed. I have two practical suggestions as to how this can be accomplished. First, music educators could benefit from a compendium on the philosophy of music education that truly represents work during the past three decades. From the ground up, such a project needs to entail an international conversation among philosophers. Multi-authored essay collections around particular topics are in vogue in music education, but they are regarded askance by academic presses because they often constitute a mixed bag of articles of varying quality and too few of these collections cohere as a whole. So, the project I envision needs to begin with a commitment to cogency, inclusiveness, and exemplary scholarship.

Second, I would like to see larger scale writing by more philosophers of music education. We are fortunate that Indiana University Press has established a series, *Counterpoints: Music and Education*, especially for this purpose. The books in the *Counterpoints* series are digitally available and affordable. The Press has a well-deserved reputation for academic integrity, and having a book accepted is not an easy task. Still, once published, sales of titles in this series can run into the thousands of copies at a time when most academic publishers count themselves fortunate to publish a few hundred copies. These books are widely read and cited—an important consideration for writers who toil, sometimes for years, on their books. This series constitutes a public space where ideas of many different stripes can be heard, valued, and interrogated as a mark of respect to those who propose them. It is also advantageous to publish philosophical books in series rather than scattered hither and yon, so they can reinforce and build one upon another. In the future, I look forward to working with music education philosophers to publish the work of those who write at length about important issues in music education.

A PERSONAL PERSPECTIVE

I recall once coming upon a wise observation that I have been unable to find again, to the effect that there are many teachers of philosophy but few philosophers, many who expound the ideas of others but few who think fresh ideas themselves. Like other philosophical sayings, this idea rings so true, that if it has not been so stated, it should have been. Here, I speak of the necessity of making one's own philosophical voice heard. In the reading that one does, it is possible to become so caught up in the ideas of other writers that one forgets about the imperative of articulating one's own perspective. When this happens, one's argument may too easily dissolve into a literature review of what others have written or even into an argument by quoting authority. One may expect that others should have the same respect for a particular authority one admires, that they should agree that invoking the name of this authority suffices to make the argument. This is

not how philosophy should work. There comes a point when it is necessary to put away one's books and the writing of others, and develop one's own argument. An authority's comments or conceptions may be helpful tools in making a point, but they should remain just that. A case in point: when I was writing on Tolkien's *Lord of the Rings* trilogy and what it might suggest for music education, diving into the Tolkien literature was like being sucked into a whirlpool from which I might never escape.⁸ Tolkien's inventions of the people, languages, arts, and cultures of Middle Earth were voluminous, and reading the library of his own work was time consuming enough before I set about mastering the world of Tolkien scholarship. All of this was so seductive and solipsistic that, once in this world, I might spend an entire working lifetime studying and expounding it. There came a moment when I realized that if I was ever to break free of it, I must stop now. I had done enough reading to make my own point on the power of myth in music education. I now needed to get on with my own project. This experience reinforced for me the idea that one may become so seduced by the ideas of others that one's entire frame of reference can become theirs, and even one's language is borrowed from them. At that point, it must be time to ask: Enough of other's views and words: what are my own?

Writing philosophy involves the creative process of designing and constructing the scaffolding or structure of an argument. Finding the "tack" one will take in a particular project is an exhilarating enterprise because an argument constitutes a new creation. For example, in writing *The Art of Teaching Music*, I employed a simple, practical, and unpretentious strategy modeled on William James's classic, *Talks to Teachers*.⁹ His words were chosen with a view to communicating conversationally with teachers and my working title was *Talks to Music Teachers* in homage to James's remarkable little book. I wanted to write about things that I had learned in decades of teaching and learning music and that I considered of utmost importance and to do for music education something of what James had done for teachers generally. Still, he was a psychologist and I am not. He chose to write about what he considered to be important for teachers and my list of topics was quite different. I asked myself, What are the aspects of music education that are so important that I must say these things to music teachers now? Having settled on the book's overall structure, it was then necessary to determine the specific aspects that I would address. At this point, I put away my books in order to write about these themes myself. As I wrote, I learned what I knew,¹⁰ and I made brief notes concerning literature that came to mind. Writing on Cape Cod during a winter, spring, and summer, some days were filled with joy as the ideas seemed to pour out and I could scarcely type fast enough. Other days were frustrating when I could not find a way forward. Then, when I solved this or that problem, the ideas and words flowed again. Only after I had written

a first draft of the book did I go back to insert references to the ideas of others, and refine my ideas in light of the published literature. This stage was crucial in putting my ideas into a wider context, polishing them, while ensuring that they were not buried under the ideas and words of others or captured by their ways of seeing things.

Finding a structure or framework on which to hang ideas is limiting as it is enabling. Every structure has its own pitfalls and limitations. For example, there are other ways in which my latest book, *Pictures of Music Education*, might have been written.¹¹ I might have taken a handful of metaphors that have special resonance in our time, teased out each one, and rhapsodically illustrated it with music educational examples. Such a book might have been compelling as the evocative and poetic character of the metaphors permeated the text, and music teachers might be inspired to think in these particular ways. Had this been my purpose, the metaphors about which I wrote and my organizational structure for each chapter might have been very different than the book I actually wrote. Rather, in response to the banality and literality of too much thinking about music education, I engaged questions relating to the way music educators need to think about what we do. I sought to sketch out an argument for figurative as well as literal thinking about music education, to illustrate the power of some of the metaphors that have been used historically and the metaphoric models to which they give rise, to juxtapose evocative drawings with philosophical text for each of the metaphor-model pairs in a “this with that” fashion of bringing together art and philosophy, and to prompt others to imagine their own metaphors and models.¹² I hoped to demonstrate that when we examine music education in terms of the music educational commonplaces of music, teaching, learning, instruction, curriculum, and administration, the resulting metaphorical models have important commonalities and differences that relate directly to the experiences of teachers and students. In the concluding meta-analysis, I sought to exemplify the possibilities of this kind of imaginative and systematic thinking about music education. The argument’s structure both enabled and limited the analysis. I was able to accomplish my overall purpose but it was impossible to tease out an array of various instances of models rooted in a particular metaphor and to illustrate sufficiently the ambiguity of the metaphors. That task must await another day.

Although the structure that a philosopher creates is imperfect, each alternative limits as much as assists in conveying one’s ideas, and although it is difficult to say everything one thinks within a single book, it is possible to say something of importance. I have resisted writing a comprehensive account of my philosophy of music education because I am still working on it. Should I ever think that I have arrived at knowing all of the answers to all of the questions I ask, I would cease to

be a philosopher in search of truth. Still, I can write a part of what I have learned, and I take heart in this possibility. Rather than a pretentious book that promises a comprehensive philosophy of music education and can be used to wield power in the field, there is wisdom in writing on facets of music education about which one can speak authoritatively at a particular time while leaving oneself space to grow. Practicing teachers can benefit from the collective efforts of philosophers of music education who approach ideas in this way. Our writing appeals variously to people, but collectively it can offer a rich source of inspiration and wisdom to those who have not had the benefit of wide reading or who are interested in other forms of research or practice. In construing creativity as a collective activity, Leonard Tan reminds us that music educators have overlooked the importance of ensemble participation, community, and other collective expressions of imagination at work.¹³ Together, the international community of philosophers of music education can create a body of literature that is greater than the sum of its parts. This is an enormously hopeful enterprise.

A CONSTRUCTIVE VISION

Philosophers of music education are obliged to go beyond criticisms of the status quo to construct music educational plans. This imperative arises from the fact that music education as construed in the West and increasingly around the world is conducted within the public sphere. For better or worse, it is generally thought of as an element of publicly supported education. Although it is also envisioned in terms of community schools, religious institutions, conservatories, private music studios, commercially sponsored instructional programs, orally-transmitted traditions through families, web-based interactive pedagogies, and the like, it concerns important matters having to do with public cultural policy, with how young and old alike should come to know music among other aspects of cultural life. Since it concerns public policy, as Paul Woodford argues, its practice is necessarily political, and as David Carr suggests, its practice is necessarily ethical, as well as aesthetic and artistic.¹⁴ It is crucial to think critically not only about music as an aspect of culture but about the practices whereby musical knowledge is passed from one generation to the next.

The array of post-modern and contemporary interdisciplinary literatures from which music education theorists have drawn in recent years has been critiqued by Robert Walker as “nihilist,” bereft of much in constructive vein beyond the criticism itself, and even dangerous to music curriculum.¹⁵ For me, this argument fails to take sufficient account of the power of the critique and its importance for music education. Although modernism has much to offer music education, I have argued in *Transforming Music Education* that a profound critique of present ideas and practices is required in order for the work of construction,

reconstruction, and transformation to transpire.¹⁶ I see value in some of the ideas offered in the plethora of literatures critical of the taken-for-granted assumptions of modernity. This critique has come very lately to music education, decades after other fields in the humanities, and one could be too quick to dismiss its importance or impatient to find practical solutions in the face of it. A conversation about post-modern ideas and music education has just begun. Recall that the first issue of the *Philosophy of Music Education* to be entirely constituted of articles in post-modern vein appeared only last year.¹⁷ A critical dialogue between modernist and post-modern philosophical views occurred in a memorable session culminating in a performance in the dying moments of the Eighth International Symposium on the Philosophy of Music Education held in Helsinki, Finland.¹⁸ It is going to take time for this critique to be worked through by philosophers in music education.

This said, criticisms of the present situation, while imperative, do not suffice. The following question demands a response: What should be done about the situation in which music educators find themselves? This is a constructive question, even if it sometimes emerges from the bowels of deconstruction. As our work concerns matters of public policy, music educators rightly look to philosophers as architects of ideas and practices that shape the field in matters of research and practice and as philosophers, we are ethically obligated to respond to these practical predicaments. We also need to respond reasonably to this question. Even though it may be important to dance and sing in response to the question, and there is a long tradition of musical performance supported by arguments for music education, it does not suffice to dance and sing. In the past, music educators have relied on actions and words. The question remains: What do we offer the field by way of helping to shape it for the better? For example, I would ask Jacques Deleuze and Felix Guattari: How would you translate your metaphor of a rhizome into public policy? Will the planting of grasses, the rhizomes that send forth their tentacles in every direction, planned and unplanned, prove to be a public policy nightmare, or will it work better than the planting of trees? One may fault the philosophical arborists and tree-planters, but will a conceptual landscape constituted entirely of grasses be any better? Would one be better off with both the trees and the grasses? Could modernist stances be better at accomplishing some tasks and post-modernist approaches better at others? Which aspects of each of these differing points of view need to be rescued? Doubtless, answers to these questions will be forthcoming in the future. Give us time.

It is fortunate when philosophers are not kings. Notwithstanding my interest in some of Plato's ideas, I would find it intolerable to live in his republic.¹⁹ Despite the ethical imperative to construct theoretical plans that meet the needs,

interests, and aspirations of those involved in music education, I do not believe that music education is best served by a monolithic philosophical vision. Rather, I want to distinguish philosophy from ideology. Although there is a place for committing to particular ideas and attempting to translate them into practice, let us call them what they are—ideologies. Philosophers are in search of truth, and our purpose is to critique all ideas and ideologies; none is sacrosanct or immune from philosophical scrutiny and interrogation, including our own. I expect the visions that philosophers of music education construct to be diverse. Rather than believing in the necessity of a single philosophy of music education to rule them all as the ring of power, I hope for the good sense and intelligence of music educational policy makers to draw on those views that they find to be helpful in constructing their plans and policies.²⁰ Our purpose as philosophers is to construct and criticize the assumptions on which educational plans are founded, and the plans themselves. I hope that philosophers of music education will repudiate politicizing the work of philosophy, resist being captured by particular ideologies of the day, and remain open to and inclusive of the work of those philosophers who choose to walk along different paths. If we do this, we may support, affirm, and empower each other to pursue the quest for our own answers to important philosophical questions in music education. And we are more likely to construct diverse visions of music education that can be helpful to its practice as well as its theory.

A RELEVANT PLAN

Philosophers of education throughout history have sought to construct educational plans for the times and places in which they worked. Within the United States, John Dewey devised a plan to cultivate and sustain a democratic republic.²¹ Although his ideas found fertile ground in widely different societies (and we remember that he was regarded by the Chinese as a “second Confucius”), he wrote primarily to an American reality.²² He spoke of his ideas simply as an educational plan that would be relevant to the education of the time.²³ He moved beyond philosophy to support educational experiments that would provide evidence of the results of applying his plan in publicly supported schools in this country.²⁴

The test of relevance in philosophy applies especially to fields that concern the conduct of public policy. Here one ascertains the degree to which an educational plan relates to, or could fit within, the educational milieu in the phenomenal world. This notion of compatibility of educational ideas and practices suggests that philosophers need to grasp the practical realities of which they speak. When philosophers have little practical experience of education, it shows, especially to those who spend their lives in educational practice. Beyond our

concern to write for academics, our audience is constituted of teachers and their students who test the relevance of our ideas to their situations. This audience is moved principally by the affinity they can imagine between our suggestions and their lived experiences.

Aside from this practical test for relevance, a theoretical test endures. A philosopher's writing is also seen in relation to the work of other scholars in the field. The task of establishing that relevance constitutes one reason to ensure that one accounts for developments and recent scholarship in one's field. Doing this in an academic world in which writers regularly shop their work from one publisher to another in the hope of finding the path of least resistance to publication is increasingly difficult. Internet publications may also offer the prospect of cheaper publication costs and can increase the quantity but not necessarily the quality of publications in the field. The explosion in publications, many of indifferent quality, is a fact of our time, and editors at academic publishing houses have commented to me on an increase of lazy and sloppy scholarship in manuscripts they receive for review. This reality necessitates working through a lot of quite mediocre work in order to find exemplary instances of scholarship. When I began to teach music in schools, I was often struck by the necessity to wade through a large amount of mediocre choral repertoire in order to find gems that I might use in my choral program. I little dreamed, then, that it would become necessary to wade through considerable mediocre scholarship in order to find the gems that I could use in my own scholarship. Happily, just as I found instances of fine choral music then, I discover examples of philosophical excellence now. In establishing theoretical relevance, I keep my eye on those outstanding examples as a source of inspiration in doing my own work. In short, establishing theoretical relevance for me, has taken on a normative character.

The same is also true of practical matters. In the midst of the din of ordinary and even problematic music education practice, I continue to look to exemplary instances of practices that suggest what might be possible more generally. It would be easy to be consumed and depressed by those instances that do not reflect enlightened thinking or practice and may even warrant Dewey's appellation of miseducation. While keeping these realities in mind, I hope that music teachers and students can do better, and I look to exemplary instances of practice as beacons for what is possible practically. These are the markers for me of outstanding practice and I keep them in mind's eye as I write about music education practice. They are the indicators of the relevance of my own writing to the possibilities of practice.

Regarding practice, it is important to remember that we are at a moment of rapid change in education. Dramatic technological changes make it possible to transform not only the ways in which music education can be undertaken

but the educational institutions themselves. Virtual universities, consortia, for-profit educational corporations, and Massively Open Online Courses (MOOCs) are transforming education at all levels including bricks-and-mortar institutions. Rather than deliver information as in the past, teachers are developing curatorial roles of assisting students to access information that is widely available and make sense of it. Education has now become a truly global phenomenon in which my students might contemporaneously and virtually be with me even though we are located in different continents and time zones. Although we cannot know what this world will eventually look like, we need to be responding to it thoughtfully and creatively. In some ways, this new world seems like a return to the fluidity of education at an earlier time when students and teachers were peripatetic and traveled to be with each other and when the hold of the home institution was less strong in demanding that they remain in a fixed location. Think about the possibilities of the philosophical specialties that we collectively represent and the advantages that students would have to study philosophy in far greater depth and breadth than if they are limited to the resource that each one of us provides. How much better that they come in contact with multiple views than that they encounter only one or a few perspectives. Today's distance learning environments provide the platforms for making this a reality at least virtually and, to a lesser extent, actually. We may explore ways that will take advantage of the collective and international experience of philosophers of music education in enriching the philosophical preparation of our students.

THE COURAGE TO SPEAK

As those who have thought about things deeply and seek to impact discourse in the public spaces, philosophers of music education need to be courageous especially in speaking forthrightly to those in positions of power and also in speaking encouragingly to those who are disempowered. From time immemorial, philosophers in the West and East have observed a connection between artistic life and the particular institutions in which it is conducted. The arts were envisaged as a means of civilization and enculturation that pointed toward a more humane and civil society. Whether construed as ends in themselves or the means to the ends of a better people and an enriched society, the arts both prefigured the good imaginatively as they pointed toward and critiqued those ends, and celebrated human ingenuity and civility as ends in themselves. Nor is the persistence of a theorized connection between artistic endeavors and ethical values at all surprising. Rather, the recorded history of the arts reveals that far from being divorced from political, religious, and economic concerns, they have long been intimately interconnected. Vested with the explicit responsibility in many countries for cultivating the arts, and educating young and old alike in the arts, arts educators

need to engage those who hold political, religious, and economic power. We must speak both to those who exercise this power and those who long to do so. Our task cannot be merely artistic, crucial as this may be. Rather, we also dwell in the messy political, religious, economic, and social world and our *raison d'être* is aspirational, namely, to improve the situation and the lives of human beings in the societies of which we are a part.

In an essay entitled, “*Pax Americana* and Music Education,” I pointed to the double-edged sword of economic and military power in a globalized and increasingly interconnected world.²⁵ The emergence of a transnational class of the über-rich—a superclass of the relative few who control the greater part of the world’s wealth and owe little allegiance to the particular people and places in which their multinational corporations, consortia, and networks are located—has only exacerbated the divisions between the have’s and have not’s. American icon corporations such as Walmart and McDonalds have generated fortunes for their owners, shareholders, and principal executives while paying their ordinary workers below-subsistence wages with few if any benefits. Factories and businesses in one part of the world may be closed summarily, without much thought for, or care about, the lives of the families that depend upon them and opened in another part of the world where even lower costs of production allow them to maximize their profits while their workers toil in oppressive circumstances for exploitative wages. Without concern for people’s welfare, the apparent triumph of “casino capitalism” around the world is a recipe for social and political unrest, violence, and revolution by the greater masses of those for whom there is no hope in sight.²⁶ When people are pushed too far by powerful forces outside their control, Karl Marx envisions an eventual revolt by those who desire a just, humane, and civil society in which they and their efforts are valued and in which they can participate meaningfully in their own governance whether in economic, religious, or political life.²⁷ This resistance and even revolution is a mixed blessing. The emergence of mass demonstrations of people demanding political and economic change, on the one hand, are accompanied by a rise of such phenomena as neo-Nazi and white supremacist organizations and the growth of religious fundamentalism and fanaticism, on the other. Whatever the outcome, cultural life is impacted for evil as well as good.

Speaking to the powerful in ways that may be critical of their empowerment and empowering to those who have been disempowered is threatening to those who hold power and do not wish to share it. The few powerful ones have weapons that can smear and destroy reputations, undermine and counteract messages of dissenters, and silence both figuratively and literally those who dare to speak contrary to their positions. It seems clear, historically, that powerful forces suppress and by any means, fair or foul, put down what they view as subversive and even

treasonous movements. For this reason, Maxine Greene laments the continuing and unfinished business of freedom, ever vulnerable and at risk without strenuous defense.²⁸ For her, educators have a profound responsibility to stand for freedom, whatever the personal or collective cost. In her view, teachers need to strive toward a more humane society in which all, irrespective of age, color, ethnicity, gender, language, or whatever the differences between people, can express the multiplicities and pluralities that we collectively are, so that all can be included, valued, and empowered. I cannot see how arts educators may do this effectively without having the courage to speak, name our worlds, and contest the violence, inhumanity, and incivility around and even within us. As those who speak from the particular perspectives of artistic education, we need to be especially sensitive and determined to critique and improve the culture of the societies in which we teach and learn.

About this “speaking,” Friedrich Schiller caught the spirit of our words and actions when he urged artists to think of people as they ought to be when we seek to influence them, and as they are when we wish to act on their behalf.²⁹ This is an idealistic and compassionate view of humanity. As philosophers, we want to speak in ways that appeal to people’s best hopes and dreams, to what they aspire to be; when we are in positions of power, we need to remember the reality of the “crooked timber of humanity,” Kant’s metaphor for the frailty of human beings, and the fact that we don’t always act as we wish we did or know we should.³⁰ We all make mistakes, we are fallible, and we may be disappointed that we have not always lived lives that we wish we could have. Paulo Freire reminds us, eloquently, that we “carry the image of the oppressor within us.”³¹ So ingrained are the values of those who have been in power over us that when we come into power, we act toward others just like they did to us. The role of education, for Freire, is to liberate us from this internalized image and help us to discover more humane and imaginative ways of being that improve the lot of others with whom we have to do. So in our speaking, we need to use our words carefully, not as weapons with which to destroy others, but in ways that exemplify the very humanity, humility, carefulness, and mutual regard we seek in our own actions. We need to seek to improve the situation and, where possible, empower others by appealing to their best selves. We need to be winsome, encouraging, and hopeful in persuading others and attracting the support of those who can help us speak. Still, we also need to be clear, unfaltering, and strong in resisting those who seek to silence us and disparage our efforts. These conflicting claims necessitate wisdom and humanity in our individual and collective “speech.”

Ironically, although this business of speaking and the courage to do so is a personal one, we can best do this in the company of others, in communities in which we aspire to treat others with respect, dignity, honesty, and integrity. Greene sug-

gests that we may not even be able to imagine how things might be different if we are bereft of community.³² Although our professional organizations should be places where we may find such a community, regrettably, they are often far from the mark and instead, places and times where people and ideas are belittled, characters are assassinated, and reputations are torn in tatters. *Ad hominem* attacks are particularly destructive, as is the blood-lust for fiery debates between people of different persuasions or invectives hurled in the midst of polemical discourse. Such cutting language, often tinged with emotive valorizations, may be interesting to those who like to witness a doctrinal debate and who think of philosophy as a combat sport. Still, this approach may generate more heat than light and undermine the crucial qualities of friendship and mutual regard that need to be present in educational communities. If, however, our language and actions are careful, well-considered, measured, eloquent, and graceful, when a community speaks collectively as it sometimes needs to do, it can empower its members individually and collectively and it can be a forceful power for good. As philosophers of music education, we deal especially with language and we are in an important position to lead the profession when the courage to speak is required. I think, for example, of the current terror of violence, the rise of anti-immigrant and anti-multicultural movements, of strident religious, political, and economic ideologies, and uncompromisingly intrusive and doctrinaire laws and policies that invariably injure women and minorities in too many contemporary societies. In the face of these developments, especially alarming in societies that espouse democratic ideals, philosophers in the arts and education need to resist these instances of inhumanity and educational and cultural narrow-mindedness. The International Society for the Philosophy of Music Education may choose to speak in response to them and in so acting, lead the music education profession internationally. Even as it educates its own members and those beyond its borders, it can act to improve our lived worlds.

In sum, I have spoken of the importance of a broad view, a personal perspective, a constructive vision, a relevant plan, and the courage to speak about aspects of music and education among other things. I do not pretend that navigating among these sometimes competing and conflicting claims is an easy undertaking. Nevertheless, I have faith in the humanity and integrity of philosophers of music education. Together, we can influence music education for the better.

NOTES

¹On archeological evidence of caring for the disabled in ancient societies, see James Gorman, "Ancient Bones that Tell a Story of Compassion," *New York Times: Science*, December 17, 2012, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/18/science/> accessed February 4, 2013. On philosophizing about music in traditional societies in Papua New Guinea, see

Steven Feld, *Sound and Sentiment: Birds, Weeping, Poetics and Song in Kaluli Expression*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990).

²On coming to pragmatism in his own words, see Richard Shusterman, "Reviewing Pragmatist Aesthetics: History, Critique and Interpretation—After Twenty Years, *European Journal on Pragmatism and American Philosophy* 4 (1) (2012): 267–276, http://lnx.journalofpragmatism.eu/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/17_shusterman.pdf, accessed February 4, 2013.

³On experimental philosophy, see Joshua Knobe and Shaun Nichols, eds., *Experimental Philosophy* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2008); Joshua Knobe, Wesley Buckwalter, Shaun Nichols, Philip Robbins, Hagop Sarkissian, and Tamler Sommers, "Experimental Philosophy," *Annual Review of Psychology* 63 (2012): 81–99.

⁴Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans., Brian Massumi (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1993).

⁵Immanuel Kant, *The Critique of Judgement: Part 1: Critique of Aesthetic Judgement*, trans., James Creed Meredith, ed., Nicholas Walker ([1911]; repr., New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2009).

⁶Forest Hansen, "In Dialogue: The Principle of Civility in Academic Discourse," *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 19, no. 2 (Fall, 2011): 198–200.

⁷See Maxine Greene, *The Dialectic of Freedom* (New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 1998).

⁸Estelle R. Jorgensen, "Music, Myth, and Education: The Case of *The Lord of the Rings* Film Trilogy," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 44, no. 1 (Spring, 2010): 44–57; "Myth, Song, and Music Education: The Case of Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings* and Swann's *The Road Goes Ever On*," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 40, no. 3 (Fall, 2006): 1–21.

⁹Jorgensen, *The Art of Teaching Music* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2008); William James, *Talks to Teachers on Psychology; and to Students on Some of Life's Ideals* ([1899, 1890]; rpt., New York: Henry Holt, 1925), Project Gutenberg, E-book #16287, www.gutenberg.org, released July 13, 2005, accessed February 18, 2013.

¹⁰Ralph Waldo Emerson, "Divinity School Address," delivered before the Senior Class in Divinity College, Cambridge, Sunday evening, July 15, 1838, <http://www.emersoncentral.com/divaddr.htm>, accessed, February 18, 2013, notes: "We mark with light in the memory the few interviews we have had . . . with souls that made our souls wiser; that spoke what we thought; that told us what we knew; that gave us leave to be what we inly were."

¹¹Jorgensen, *Pictures of Music Education* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2011).

¹²Jorgensen, "This with That": A Dialectical Approach to Teaching for Musical Imagination," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 40, no. 4 (Winter, 2006): 1–20.

¹³Leonard Yuh Chaur Tan, "Towards a Transcultural Philosophy of Instrumental Music Education," Unpublished Ph.D dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, December 2012.

¹⁴Paul Woodford, *Democracy and Music Education: Liberalism, Ethics, and the Politics of Practice* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2005); David Carr, "The Significance of Music for the Promotion of Moral and Spiritual Value," *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 14, no. 2 (Fall, 2006): 103–117.

¹⁵Robert Walker, "Avoiding the Dangers of Postmodern Nihilist Curricula in Music Education," in Bowman and Frega, eds, *Handbook on Philosophy in Music Education*, 386–405.

¹⁶Jorgensen, *Transforming Music Education* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2003).

¹⁷See *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 20, no. 1 (Spring, 2012).

¹⁸Jorgensen and Iris M. Yob, "Deconstructing Deleuze and Guattari's *A Thousand Plateaus*, for Music Education" (now published in the *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 47, no. 3 (Fall 2013): 36–55 and Elizabeth Gould's response, Eighth International Symposium in the Philosophy of Music Education, Sibelius Academy, Helsinki, Finland, June 12, 2010.

¹⁹Plato, *Republic*, trans., Robin Waterfield (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1993).

²⁰Gregory Basham and Eric Bronson, eds., *The Lord of the Rings and Philosophy: One Book to Rule Them All* (Chicago and La Salle, IL: Open Court, 2003).

²¹John Dewey, *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* ([1916]; repr., New York, NY: Simon and Schuster, 1997).

²²Tan, "Towards a Transcultural Philosophy of Instrumental Music Education," p. 53, n. 224. Also see Joseph Grange, *John Dewey, Confucius, and Global Philosophy* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2004), p. 85.

²³John Dewey, *Experience and Education* ([1938]; repr., New York, NY: Touchstone Edition, Simon and Schuster, 1997).

²⁴See J. J. Chambliss, *John Dewey's Laboratory School as a Social Experiment* (Infinity Publishing, 2000); Laurel N. Tanner, *Dewey's Laboratory School: Lessons for Today* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1997); Katherine Camp Mayhew and Anna Camp Edwards, *The Dewey School: The Laboratory School of the University of Chicago, 1896–1903*, intro. John Dewey (New York, NY: Atherton Press, c. 1965).

²⁵Jorgensen, "Pax Americana and the World of Music Education," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 38, no. 3 (Autumn, 2004): 1–18.

²⁶Susan Strange, *Casino Capitalism* (1986; repr., Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1997).

²⁷Karl Marx, *Capital*: Vol. 1: *A Critique of Political Economy*, intro., Ernest Mandel, trans., Ben Fowkes ([1976]; repr., Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin, 1990).

²⁸Greene, *The Dialectic of Freedom* (New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 1988).

²⁹Friedrich Schiller, *On the Aesthetic Education of Man*, trans., Reginald Snell ([1954]; Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 2004).

³⁰See Isaiah Berlin, *The Crooked Timber of Humanity: Chapters in the History of Ideas* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998).

³¹Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, trans., Myra Bergman Ramos, intro., Donaldo Macedo, and 30th Anniversary Edition (New York, NY: Continuum, 2007).

³²Greene, *Dialectic of Freedom*.